

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. XXX. No. 23.] Written in England JUNE 8.—Published at New-York SEPT. 10, 1816.

705]

[706

TO CORRESPONDENTS,

*On the subject of Emigration to America.
—Arrival of Literary Ambassadors at
New-York.*

I can easily excuse, at a moment like the present, the applications that are made to me for information upon this subject. More than 2,000 passports, the papers tell us, have been granted within *one month*, to persons emigrating to the continent of Europe; and, we learn, through the same channels, "that many men, who have obtained *certificates* from the Justices of the Peace to go to *America*, have left their wives and children for the parish to keep." This *America* cannot be the *real America*; the flourishing, the happy America, where a strong, able, sober labourer may, if he choose, live well and save 30 pounds sterling a year. Because, to go to *this America*, a man needs no *certificate* from any body, as the law now stands. I am not aware that I can, at present, give any information in particular relative to emigration. I will never advise any person to emigrate; but, I will, from time to time, give the best information I possess as to the state of America; and I promise myself that this information will soon become very regular and perfectly accurate; for, I have the very great pleasure of informing my readers, that my ambassadors arrived at the beautiful city of New-York on the 10th of May, after a very tempestuous voyage. On the 11th, they write to me a hasty letter, in which, however, they state, that New-York surpasses their most sanguine expectations, though those expectations had been raised very high. They say, that *ten thousand* persons have arrived at that one city, from Europe, since the peace; and that the last year's importation of merchandise in that port alone has amounted to *fifty-three millions of dollars*. But, these parts of their letter are far less interesting to me than another part, which informs me of a recent triumph of the principles of *real* freedom over all their foolish and wicked opponents. An Albany paper, which the Ambassadors have en-

closed in their despatch No. 1. shows me, that, for the House of Assembly of the great and opulent State of New-York, 88 members, out of 126, have been just chosen by the sworn enemies of what has been impudently called "*legitimacy*." But, a paragraph from a New-York paper, which is a Cossack, apparently, and devoted to the English *Factory* there, has pleased me more than any thing else. This paper is called "*The New-York Evening Post*;" the date is 10th of May; and the paragraph is in the following words:—"We perceive, by the ship-news of the day, that the agent which Cobbett so condescendingly promised to send to New-York early in the present spring, has *actually arrived this forenoon*. But he has reached his destination *the day after the fair*, owing to the very long passage the ship has had no less than 75 days. Had he come a fortnight sooner, and commenced his operations, he might have *laid claim to the honour of the victory which democracy has lately achieved*." Thus I have the best possible proof that the cause of freedom triumphs in that country. Yes, the recent events in Europe have opened the eyes of those persons in America who were not *quite blind*; and these events will not be tardy in driving from public hearing any man, in that country, who shall still remain base enough to attempt to support the principles of despotism. "*The day after the fair!*" Oh, no, Sir! My Ambassadors were not despatched, I can assure you, on any *transient* errand. They are not sent for any *special* purpose. They are not ministers *extraordinary*, whose business it is to qualify for a good thumping pension for the rest of their lives. They are to be *resident ambassadors* at the great court of freedom in America, and are to be the regular channel of communication between that court and the free minds at Botley. Oh, no, Sir! Mine are none of those sneaking missionaries, those palavering professors of friendship, those spies under the garb of affection, those Satanic interlopers, who, while they smile on and wheedle you, are plotting in their malignant hearts, how they shall transform your Paradise into a place resembling the hells that

they have left behind them. Oh, no, Sir! My Ambassadors were not sent for the purpose of aiding in the decision of one election. Such an object, if I were vain enough to suppose myself capable of effecting it, would be of too temporary a nature. My object is to *keep up a literary intercourse* with your country. By the means of that intercourse I mean to make known to you, and to the people of England, truths the most important, and truths, which, without an intercourse of this *very* description, can never be made known. The origin of this mission I have explained. The motives have been as truly stated to the public as to my own pillow. I have disguised no step that I have taken, and no single step will I disguise, or attempt to disguise. It appears to me, and long has appeared to me, that the cause of freedom could in no possible way be so effectually assisted, and that of despotism so effectually assailed, as by making the people of America and of England well acquainted with all that passes and has passed in the countries respectively, and by spreading through the world, by means of the American press, facts which otherwise must remain long, and, perhaps, for ever, unknown. I have before described the manner in which the two nations, the *two peoples*, have been kept in a state of ignorance with regard to each other. The newspapers, and other periodical publications, going from England, have been, and must continue to be, the grossest deceivers upon earth. Nine tenths of them are devoted to corruption; the other tenth are held in awe. *No truth*, no useful political truth, can possibly go through such a channel. From America excellent matter *might* always have been received; but, the channel was not open. The persons corresponding with each other in the two countries, were such as were by no means likely to feel any interest, much less any *zeal*, in the promulgation of useful political truths. Hence no periodical publications reached us (except by mere accident) but such as represented the American people in the odious light of friends of despotism on the one side, and as bloody-minded savages on the other. I have before shown how all my endeavours to obtain a regular supply of true information have been defeated, and even during the last week of May, two parcels, kindly sent me by Mr. Mitchell of the National Advocate of New-York, have

been lost to me, in consequence of their having been sent to the Post-office by the Captain of the ship *Triton*, from which office they came to me, charged with postage to the amount of *thirteen pounds sterling*! Now, I ask not any lover of truth; not any friend of fair-play; but, I ask any hypocritical Cossack, of either country, whether it be not laudable to endeavour to surmount such obstacles to free discussion; such unnatural, such odious bars between the minds of men? I have not only *endeavoured* to surmount them; I *have surmounted* them. And if the hopes and expectations of a mind naturally sanguine do not deceive me, upon a point where a parent is most likely to be too sanguine, the success of the enterprise is placed even beyond the powers of disease and of death itself. Experience has taught me not to be so stupidly conceited as to suppose, that I or my sons are able to be *directly* the worker or workers of the great good that I contemplate. But, as those humble creatures, the silk-worm and the sheep, supply the means of clothing and decorating so large a part of man and woman-kind; so may our materials, by passing through abler hands, largely contribute towards the dissemination of useful political knowledge; towards the storing of the minds of the rising generation with interesting facts and sound deductions; towards keeping alive the flame of real liberty, at a time when the most enormous and atrocious efforts are making to extinguish every spark of the sacred fire in every human heart.

WM. COBBETT.

TO THE
PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.
LETTER XVI.

Reduction of the Debt talked of in the House of Commons.—Mr. Smith.—Charge against him by the Government writers.—The lands of the Borough-mongers in danger—also the estates of the plunderers by land and by sea.—Wicked part which the Clergy have taken in creating the debt.—Blowing up of the funding system of great benefit to the whole world.

Botley, 8th June, 1816.

The great subject, the *touching of the interest of the National Debt*, has, at last, been clearly stated in Parliament. I ob-

served, several months ago, that the matter would begin to be *talked of* this session; and, that, in all human probability, the *next session* would see something *done*. It is a subject of infinite importance, not only to us, but to *the whole world*; for, into what part, what nook or corner of the world, does not this government thrust its hand? And, therefore, as you may be well assured, the fate of this government, or, rather, this present system of sway, depends entirely upon the fate of the funds; that is to say, upon the capacity of the government to get from the nation at large the means of paying the interest of the Debt which the government has contracted; as you may be well assured that this is the case, you will want nothing more to convince you, that the subject now before us is the most interesting that can be imagined to the liberties and happiness of mankind. All the kings and emperors of Europe; the Bourbons and the Royalists; the Pope; the Dominicans; the Jesuits; the Holy Office; the Cossack Priesthood of America:—all have a deep interest in this question. In short, the very existence of tyranny in every part of the civilized world depends on it: and, therefore, I shall not scruple to go into it in the fullest manner that my limits will allow.

In the House of Commons, on the 31st of May, a Mr. JOHN PETER GRANT, who is a Scotch Lawyer, I believe, (for I have never heard of him till this winter,) because I see that he is a member of the *Kelt Society*, and because they call him “the *learned gentleman*,” brought forward a series of *resolutions* on the state of the *finances*. It has been a custom, for many years, for some man, who belongs to what is called “the *opposition*,” the nature and end of which I have so clearly described to you, to bring forward a set of formal propositions, describing the state of the finances; and, of course, with a view to produce an impression unfavourable to the ministry and their management. As a counterpart to such propositions, the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the time being has always produced a set of propositions of an opposite tendency, which, he having always a majority of votes, have been passed by the House after the rejection of those of the opposition men. This office of Annual Resolution Proposer was filled, for many years, by Mr. Sheridan; it then

fell to Mr. Tierney; next it was taken up by a Mr. George Johnstone, whom I have not heard of for some years. He went out of public life like the snuff of a rush-light. I should really be glad to know what became of him. He worked so hard at this resolution grinding, that, in hot weather he used actually, as I was informed, to strip to his shirt while engaged in it. Whether such intense application of the mind proved injurious to his intellectual or corporeal faculties, and thereby operated at once as a check to the pursuit in him, and a discouragement to it in others, I know not; but, since his time, no one has undertaken the sublime task until a sufficiency of talent, courage, and patriotism were found in Mr. J. P. Grant, above mentioned.

As I am not aware, that it would be possible for you to gather one single jot of useful information from a perusal of the speech and the resolutions of Mr. Grant; as I am quite convinced, that every attentive reader of the Register must understand the real state of our financial resources and operations a great deal better than, from that speech and those resolutions, Mr. J. P. Grant appears to me to understand them, I will not impose on you the fruitless task of reading either the one or the other.

But, that which was said upon this occasion by Mr. SMITH, one of the members for the city of Norwich, is of great importance, especially when we view it in conjunction with what was said *in reply* by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and with what it has called forth from the hired prints of this country. I will first give you the report of the words of Mr. Smith, which is as follows:

“Mr. W. Smith rose to second the motion, and said that though great accuracy of detail had been brought forward by the honourable mover, yet this was not necessary in his view of the question. He did not attach any blame to His Majesty’s Ministers: the difficulties in which they had been placed were an excuse for many errors; but he recollected that he had seconded the repeal of the Income Tax, not because he thought the money was not wanted, but because the measure itself was so unconstitutional, that he thought it incumbent on Parliament to redeem the pledge that had been given by the Minister,

“ and repeal the tax. It might be said
 “ that his honourable friend had erred in
 “ some trifling particulars; but with that
 “ he had nothing to do: those sums were
 “ so small that they made no impression
 “ on the total deficit. Making all allow-
 “ ances for any errors or over-statements
 “ in the resolutions of his honourable and
 “ learned friend, the gloomy conclusion
 “ could not be got rid of, that in the next
 “ year there would be a great deficiency
 “ in the finances. Whether the deficien-
 “ cy was 10 or 20 millions, it was still
 “ appalling, and he was convinced that it
 “ could *only be provided for by the reme-
 “ dy which he had formerly hinted at.* He
 “ wished his persuasion of that necessity
 “ had proceeded from ignorance or de-
 “ spair, but he confessed that he did not
 “ contemplate the remedy he had alluded
 “ to, with *that dismay* with which others
 “ beheld it. If difficulties were looked
 “ in the face, it could not be disguised
 “ that, *sooner or later, some reduction
 “ must be made in the dividends; and*
 “ though some gentlemen had looked to
 “ such a measure with the most fearful
 “ and gloomy apprehensions of the conse-
 “ quences, he did not think that the ef-
 “ fect would be so dangerous as was
 “ imagined.”

Now, it is no more than justice to my-
 self to state, that I, several months ago,
 said in the Register, that this matter would
 be *begun to be talked about* during this
 very session of Parliament; that, from the
 moment the *peace* was first talked of, I
 warned the country against hoping to see
 the taxes reduced, unless loans were made
 in time of peace, or unless a reduction
 were made in the dividends on the debt,
 or unless the system of rule were totally
 changed. To keep up this system I knew
 that a large peace establishment would be
 necessary. Every day of the session has
 brought some new proof of the correctness
 of these opinions. Many *hints* have been
 thrown out about a reduction of the divi-
 dends; but, at last, the hints have been
 changed into plain expressions. We will
 now see (*for this is very important*) what
 the Chancellor of the Exchequer said in
 answer to this remark of Mr. Smith. We
 shall find him reprobating the proposition;
 but, we shall not find him showing, that
 the thing proposed can be avoided without
 re-imposing the odious tax on income.

“ The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER

“ admitted that the honourable and learn-
 “ ed Gentleman (Mr. Grant) had done
 “ himself credit by the clearness of his
 “ statement, and the abilities he had dis-
 “ played; but it was impossible that he
 “ could concur in his resolutions, which
 “ *added but one to the strings of gloomy
 “ prognostications, which had regularly
 “ been submitted to Parliament at the
 “ close of the session, and which had
 “ never been acceded to by the House.*
 “ The country, *from year to year, had
 “ surmounted its difficulties, in spite of
 “ these predictions, and had finally tri-
 “ umphed in its great contest; and he
 “ trusted that experience would show, that
 “ the honourable and learned gentleman’s
 “ resolutions were at least as groundless
 “ as those of any of his predecessors.*
 “ The present *difficulties of the country
 “ were great, but, compared with those of
 “ former years, not very alarming.* We
 “ had long *contended for existence.* Now
 “ the question was, *whether we could dis-
 “ pense with burthens which the country had
 “ before borne, and from which it had been
 “ relieved.* He trusted that the country
 “ would not need to *recur to those bur-
 “ thens, but at any rate the country would
 “ not be reduced to the extraordinary
 “ remedy hinted at by the Honourable
 “ Secunder (Mr. Smith.)* This remedy,
 “ which the Honourable Member had
 “ mentioned less distinctly than became
 “ the proposer of such a measure, was
 “ *nothing less than a national bankruptcy.*
 “ The Honourable Member had on a for-
 “ mer occasion spoken of the same propo-
 “ sal more distinctly, *under the name of a
 “ reduction of the interest of the National
 “ Debt.* It could not be necessary to say,
 “ that to a proposition so *devoid of justice
 “ and wisdom, the house would never ac-
 “ cede.* The country would *lose more in
 “ credit and resources of every kind, than
 “ it could in a manner gain by such an enor-
 “ mous breach of faith.* (*Hear, hear,
 “ hear!*) Whatever burthens were impos-
 “ sed on the stockholders, in common with
 “ other classes of the King’s subjects, they
 “ would cheerfully bear, as they had
 “ cheerfully borne the tax on their proper-
 “ ty, when plausible reasons might have
 “ been urged against it. On this *extraor-
 “ dinary proposal, it was unnecessary to
 “ say more.*”

As to the “ gloomy predictions” hav-
 ing hitherto proved “ groundless,” if the

fact were such, that would be no reason to believe, that such predictions will now prove groundless. The affairs of a nation, as they are a long while in moving, so they are slow in falling into utter confusion. "It is the *last feather*," as PAINE says, "which breaks the horse's back." Besides, what is *ruin*? If, twenty-five years ago, we had been told that the nation would be ruined, we might have asked the prophet, "What do you call *ruin*?" And, if he had said "Why, the whole "of the real property of the country will "be taxed to the full amount of the rent; "the farmer will pay to the government "more than he will pay to the landlord; "the poor rates will amount to eight millions of pounds sterling a year; every "fifth man will become a pauper or a "beggar; it will be necessary to keep "up in time of peace a regular army of "150 thousand men; soldiers will be "openly avowed to be employed, in a "considerable part of the kingdom, to "collect the taxes and make the people "pay their tithes; misery will, at last, "prevail to such a degree, that the occupiers of land will decamp, leaving whole "parishes in a wild state, and the poor to "seek food how they can; the rich will "flee to the Continent of Europe in order "to avoid paying such heavy taxes; it "will be proposed in Parliament to pass "a law to compel them to remain at "home; thousands and thousands of the "hardy and enterprising will go to America to better their lot; the jails will be "filled with Debtors, lately persons of "great respectability and of competence."

If this had been the answer of a prophesying politician twenty-five years ago, should we not have said: "Ay! this "would, indeed, be *ruin*; but this never "will take place!" Would not this have been our reply? Well, then, is not ruin *actually arrived*? The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in order to obtain any degree of weight to his argument, should have shown, that the country was ever before in such a state. On the contrary, he acknowledges, and well he may, that the *difficulties* of the country are great, though, he says, "not very alarming." And, then he rides off upon the observation, that we "have been *contending for our existence*." This I deny. I deny that the war was either necessary or just.

We will, therefore, throw this interloping observation aside, and stick to the matter in dispute.

The Chancellor plainly enough indicates his opinion, that the thing cannot go on without the Income Tax. "The *only* "question," he says, "is, whether we can "dispense" with that Tax or not. And, in spite of his "*trusting*" that we *can*, Mr. PEARSONBY very justly concluded, that the intention was to re-impose that terrible impost: in answer to which conclusion no observation was made. It is clear as daylight, that it will be impossible to pay the interest of the Debt, and to keep up even one half of the peace establishment, without the *Income Tax*, or, without *large loans*. The latter would, in a few years, blow up the whole system; the former would hasten greatly the exchange of real property from hand to hand. The present owners of estates must lose them, and that, too, in a very few years; and, before this can take place, a serious struggle of some sort must and will take place.

The Chancellor, poor man, appears to have been quite *shocked* at the proposition of Mr. Smith. He spoke of a reduction of the Dividends as being "nothing less than a *National Bankruptcy*;" as something "so devoid of justice that the "House would never accede to it; as an "enormous breach of faith." And, indeed, Mr. J. P. Grant appears to have concurred in these views of the proposition. But, then, we may very reasonably ask Mr. J. P. Grant, why *he* did not point out some *other* remedy for that defalcation which he said would *certainly* take place. As to the *breach of faith*, we will observe on it presently, when we have heard what the *Courier* of the next day said on the subject. And, here, you will please to observe, that you are not to look upon the article I am about to quote as the production of the proprietor, or editor, of the *Courier*; but as the production of the Chancellor himself, or of the Secretaries of the Treasury, who regularly pay this newspaper, and on whom the proprietor is in as daily attendance as any valet is on his master. The speeches in the House carried forth a rather unsatisfactory answer to Mr. Smith, which was to be made up for in the same paper which conveyed those speeches to the public. This article is, in fact, to be looked upon as a de-

cument issued by the Treasury; and, therefore, worthy of great attention. Observe how they menace the Land-owners. *The conflict of interests*, which I have before described to you so fully, is here actually beginning to break out.

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed his strong, unqualified, and final dissent from the opinions advanced by Mr. W. Smith, which were understood to be in favour of *diminishing the interest on the National Debt*. Mr. W. Smith has suggested this remedy for our embarrassments on former occasions. There is not much of ingenuity or originality in the suggestion, though there is much of *boldness and of mischief*. Reduce the interest! Why not reduce the principal also? Of what value would be the principal without the interest? There is no engagement to repay the principal; the only engagement is to pay the interest. The property, therefore, consists in the interest, and *not in the principal*. And why, exclusively, rob those individuals of their property, who have been the *most forward to assist* the country in the hour of distress; who have, with the most ready confidence, placed their faith in Parliament? By what tenure do they hold their property? By the *law of the land*, solemnly enacted by the three branches of the Legislature. By what tenure do the *Landholders* hold their property? By law also: not indeed by statute law, but by common law, by usage. *How came the Duke of Bedford, for instance, by his great landed estates?* His ancestors having travelled on the continent; a lively, pleasant man, became the companion of a foreign Prince, wrecked on the Dorsetshire coast, where Mr. RUSSELL lived. The Prince recommended him to HENRY VIII. who, liking his company, gave him *a large share of the plundered Church lands*. Why should such a property be more respected than that which has been acquired by the merchant, the manufacturer, the soldier, the sailor, the artisan; and which, on the faith of Parliament, has been advanced to Government? Should the gifts of a capricious tyrant be more respected than property which has been *hardly earned*, and placed under the protection of the three branches of the legislature? In

principle we may perhaps agree with Mr. Smith. Let the *funded and landed and other property* equally contribute to the reduction of the national debt. *Let a part of the land go to this purpose as well as a part of the funds*. The Property Tax fell on all alike, and so should the burthen of attaining the object Mr. Smith has in view, *which is undoubtedly a most desirable one*. The Landholders, who constitute nine tenths of the parliament, have decreed that the landed estates of Bankers are liable to their debts. The Parliament is the debtor of the *Fundholder*, and will it renounce its own principle of justice for its *own particular advantage*? Will it *borrow money to ease its own property, and then refuse to pay*? This would be *swindling*. A County Member lately complained in parliament, that commodities being now cheap, a Stockholder could buy double the quantity he lately could do, while Landholders' incomes were diminishing. But what is the truth? The war reduced the *power of purchase* by the Stockholder to one half, while that of the Landholder was more than doubled; and now that prices are beginning to return a little towards their former state, the Landholder cries out because the monstrous inequality does not continue in his favour! *He has been wallowing in wealth while the income of the stockholder has been deprived more and more every year of its efficiency*; and now he complains that this *injustice does not continue*! But we are not inclined to believe the resources of the country unequal to its necessities. At the end of the American war the same disproportion existed. Our difficulties are undoubtedly great, and must be met with rigid economy; but our dangers are at present *only speculative*. We must experience *a few years of peace to ascertain our real situation*. Our resources grew with the war; they expanded, adapted themselves to every occasion. How gloomy were the predictions when the great commercial failures took place in 1793, and how have they been belied! Is not peace more friendly to national wealth than war? The change from the one state to the other may shock and alarm, but experience in the past should inspire confidence in the future. Of this we are certain, that a *bankrupt-*

"cy, such as Mr. Smith hints at, would produce a Revolution. Those most attached to Church and State, as now existing, would be ruined; depreciation of commodities, want of employment, riots, insurrections, confusion, would ensue. The only doubt would be, whether the troubles would end in the establishment of a Military Government; or of a Republic, ruled by Dissenters.—The friends of the present system would disappear."

John Bull will look upon this article as the offspring of the brain of that meritorious person, Mr. STUART, who, from being a journeyman taylor, has mounted from the shop-board to a chariot by the means of the Courier, and which Mr. Stuart never did, I have heard, write a paragraph in his life. But you know whence the article really comes; it is a subject, upon which the Opposition papers are wholly silent. To the *faction* it is like a hot poker. They dare not touch it yet. It must be first exposed a little to the air to get cool. Mr. SMITH is of no faction. He wants neither place nor pension. He has, therefore, spoken out.

Let us, now, examine this article, and see what it is made of. It is very true, that the suggestion is not *novel*, if we include what has been said out of Parliament, for, I suggested the necessity of such a measure *more than ten years ago*; and, if it had been adopted at that time, with the qualifications that I proposed, the present difficulties and scenes of distress would never have existed. It is true, on the other hand, that, in all human probability, the Bourbons would never have been restored; the Pope would still have been a wanderer; the Dominicans and Jesuits might have still been waiters at inns; the Protestants of France might have still lived in safety; the public buildings at Washington might have not furnished a subject for "the most brilliant dash of the whole war," as the *Morning Chronicle* called it; and we might have had no Waterloo monument. But, I am quite sure, that the real peace and happiness of the country might, at that time, have been restored, without any serious and lasting injury to any description of persons. So far, however, was I from being heard with attention, that the newspapers of both parties fell upon me as if I were a monster in human shape. I was accused of being a swindler, a robber, a

murderer; as if the debt had been due from me only! Mr. SHERIDAN (wise patriot!) accused me in parliament; and gave hints to the Attorney General, which were by no means unintelligible, that it would be proper to lay his hands upon a man who was endeavouring to ruin the credit of the country. Whether Mr. Sheridan be yet alive I have no means of knowing; but, if he be, and in a state to observe what is passing at this time, I hope he will have the justice to feel a little shame for his conduct of that day.

Though not *novel*, the writer says, that Mr. Smith's proposal is "*bold and mischievous*." This is precisely the old cant. Bold! What, then, does it require any very great degree of boldness to propose a measure in Parliament? To entitle the act to the merit of boldness, there must exist some *danger*; and, is it pretended, that Mr. Smith exposed himself to danger upon this occasion? I can remember, indeed, when Mr. ROBSON's words were taken down, upon his saying that the Bank Notes were little better than assignats, the Speaker declaring, that any Honourable Member was *disorderly*, who should say any thing to the prejudice of the credit of the country. Poor Mr. ROBSON ate his words with all imaginable despatch; and seemed to think himself very well off so to get out of the affair. But, that time is past. Mr. Smith may now not only suggest, but may propose, this measure without any degree of danger.

As to the *mischievousness* of the proposition, or, rather, suggestion, what was ever suggested, which tended to expose the system, and which was not called *mischievous*? Either Mr. Smith has reason on his side, or he has not. If he has not, it is easy to expose the fallacy of his suggestion; if he has, his suggestion ought to be attended to, and is likely to do good. But, this is the sort of charge under which a bad cause always endeavours to shelter itself. No one is impudent enough to deny the benefit that must, as to all public matters, arise from *free discussion*. No one, not even the most interested priest, will deny this, as to matters of religion. But, when the pinch comes; when either the minister or the priest sees his system, or his measures, in danger from this free discussion; he then resorts to the charge of *mischievousness*, which he boldly brings against his opponent, whom he loads with all kinds of abuse and the imputation of

every bad motive ; and then, wrapping himself up in dignified silence, calls upon the Attorney General *to do his office* ; and when once this gentleman sets to work, he soon teaches your man of free discussion what is the real meaning of those words. This was literally the conduct of BURKE towards PAINE. The latter, having no support of any sort but that of his talents, sent forth *fifty thousand* copies of an answer to a book of the former, which, even with a government to push it about, had not reached, and never did reach, a *sale of ten thousand*. Finding himself defeated and exposed, and unable to reply, BURKE actually, in his place in Parliament, called on the Attorney General to make the reply ! The call was speedily answered ; the prosecution was carried on with success ; Paine had his choice between Newgate and flight ; his work was suppressed ; fifty men, perhaps, first and last, were punished for promulgating the work ; but, after all, Paine's work is sought after with avidity, at almost any price, while that of Burke may be got from any bulk or stall in London at a price little higher than that of waste-paper. So much for *free* discussion in England ! So much for the term "*mischievousness*."

Happily for Mr. SMITH, he stands in no fear of an answer in the form of an ex-officio information. He has a place to speak from which protects him from all the danger, contained in the hints of the Courier. He dares speak out, he has spoken out, and others will, at no distant day, follow his example.

The cavil, which this writer makes about the *principal* amounts to nothing. To be sure, Mr. Smith means, that a part of the *property* of the fundholder must be taken away ; that is to say, that the nation cannot pay the whole amount of the debt. He has *not said*, however, nor has any body else, that the land-owners are not to lose *part of their property also*. The question with me is not, whether the land-owners are to lose part of their property as well as the fundholders ; but whether taxes sufficient to pay the fundholders can be raised. This writer says, that *the law* is the guardian of property, and especially of funded property. Why, the law is, or was, the guardian of many things. The *law* guaranteed the right of the people to elect even their Sheriffs ; the *law* guaranteed to the people the

right of taxing themselves ; the *law* even now forbids any place of profit or trust, civil or military, or any pension, to be bestowed upon any person not a *natural born* subject of the king of this kingdom. Yet, how stands the *practice*, compared with the law, in these cases ? The *law* says, that no foreigner, *though naturalized by act of parliament*, (as the Prince of Saxe-Cobourg has been,) shall hold any place of profit or trust, civil or military. The *law* says that the people shall have the benefit of the *Act of Habeas Corpus* ; and, if this law can be suspended, for seven years together, by another law, why may not the law about the funds ? The *law* forbade Pitt to lend the public money to Boyd and Benfield to enable them to make good an instalment on a loan ; but, when Pitt was discovered to have done this, another law was passed to screen him from punishment ; and, if this can be done, if law can be rendered flexible in such matters as these, why not in the case before us ? To come closer to the point ; the *law* compelled the Bank Company to pay their bills in Gold and Silver on demand. They *refused* to do this ; and a law was passed to screen them from punishment for the refusal. The *law* compelled tenants to pay their landlords in gold and silver ; but another law, *after the contract*, was made to authorize them to pay in Bank Notes. The *law* compelled tenants to pay the whole of their stipulated rents to their landlords ; but another law was passed to compel the tenants to withhold a part of their rent, and to pay it over to the government's taxing people. The *law* made certain lands unalienable, but another law authorized the temporary possessors to sell them under the name of *redeeming the land-tax* ; and thus were entailed estates taken, in part, absolutely and for ever from the heirs.

So that, to talk about *the law* is, perhaps, the very foolishlest thing which this writer could have done. The common law, he says, guarantees to men the possession of their lands ; but, it did not guaranty the heirs of those who sold part of their entailed estates under the Land Tax Redemption Bill. The law guaranteed the due execution of the will of Lady Mildmay's father respecting an estate in Essex ; but, Pitt and the Parliament found another law to set that will, in part at least, aside. Why, if such

things as these can be done, what a cavil is it to set up the *law* in opposition to the proposal of Mr. Smith!

But, this writer says, that, if the fundholders lose a part, so ought the landowners; and that an estate in the funds is held by as good a *tenure* as the Duke of Bedford's estate. I very much like to hear this sort of language; because it tends to bring the parties at once to issue. And, I like it, too, on another account: it shows what sort of a conflict we shall, at last, come to. "Let part of the land go to this purpose as well as part of the funds." That is to say, let part of the estates be sold and given to the fundholders. To this I have no sort of objection, upon the principle of the Courier, namely, that "the Parliament is the Debtor of the Fundholder." They have borrowed the money; and they ought to pay it back. The case of the Bankers, as cited here, is complete. Their lands are made liable for their debts. And why not the lands of the Members of both Houses of Parliament? This writer asks, "will the Parliament renounce its own principle for its own peculiar advantage? Will it borrow money to ease its own property, and then refuse to pay? This would be *swindling*."

Answer him, Giles Jolterhead, Esq.: Answer him, I say; for I will not. But, to you, in America, I must address a few remarks upon this very interesting part of the subject. The plain, unvarnished case, stated by an unshackled pen, is, then, as follows: The money has been spent for the purpose of hiring foreign powers, and of sending forth fleets and armies, in order to crush liberty in Europe and America, lest the people of England and Ireland, following the example of France and America, should shake off the yoke of their tyrants. In order to secure the aid of the nation in this enterprise, hundreds of millions have been expended in *bribes* of one sort or another. Every family of any note has shared in the plunder. The innumerable offices in the army, the navy, and in the taxing and colonial branches, have been filled by the relations, or the creatures, of those, who had any means of influencing votes in the Parliament. This is the way in which the money has been spent. Only think of a man like Rose having actually received more than 300,000 pounds of the public money! But, these sums never

would, and never could, be raised in taxes. Loans have, therefore, been resorted to for the purpose. By the means of Loans the government got possession of the savings of all people in commerce and trade, which was exactly what suited the Boroughmongers, who, though their estates were taxed along with those of other people, really *gained* by the war, even in a pecuniary point of view; for, they, and their relations and dependants, did, in fact, receive more than they paid. The Boroughmongers did, in short, borrow money in the name of the public, part of which they pocketed themselves, and part of which they expended for the purpose of keeping up their usurpation of the people's rights.

Many of those who lent this money have been actuated by the motive of gain only; many merely by the desire of security without trouble; some certainly have been, in part, plunderers themselves; some have, like the king and queen, received the taxes with one hand, and lent the amount to the *public*, as it is called, with the other. Lord Camden now receives yearly about 40 thousand pounds out of the taxes, which he puts regularly into the funds. The Scotts, Idles, Irvings, Williamses, Thorntons, Prices, and a thousand other contractors, have taken the money, or, rather, swept it in, one hour, and, the next, put it in the funds. However, the great mass of the Fundholders must be *innocent* persons; and to leave them pennyless while the Boroughmongers keep their estates is what common justice forbids.

Yet, that this is what the latter would now wish to do is quite clear to me. The refusal of the Income Tax was but a *first step*. They took advantage of the popular cry against that Tax, which, though felt by all other classes, was most felt by themselves. To continue to make *loans* in time of peace is impossible for any length of time. The Boroughmongers, therefore, see, that this source is not only dried up, but, that its place must be supplied by drains upon their estates. The offices, salaries, the jobs of the war, no longer come in to compensate them for their loss by taxes. What is, then, to be done? Why, get rid of the debt, or, at least, of a great part of it. But then comes the conflict between the Boroughmongers and the Fundholders; and, during this battle, the people recover their liberties!

This is the dread of the Boroughmongers. The writer in the *Courier* says, "A Military Government; or a Republic, ruled by Dissenters.—The friends of the *present system* would *disappear*." As to a "*military* government," if that be not one which exists here *now*, where is there one upon the face of the earth? The country is filled with Barracks; regular soldiers are constantly on foot to keep the people in order, to shoot at and to kill them. Regular soldiers guard the judges and the gallows. Regular soldiers openly and notoriously collect the taxes and tithes in many parts of the kingdom. What impudence, then, to talk of the *danger* of our having, from any cause, a military government! But, as to "*a Republic*," that, with whatever *evils* it *may* contain, I think quite within the scope of *possibility*. As to *Dissenters*, there would, in such a case, be no distinctions about religion. But, I fully concur in the opinion of this writer, that "*the friends of the present system* would *disappear*." And so fear the Boroughmongers; and it is that fear, and that fear alone, which now withholds them from refusing to pay the interest of the money which they have borrowed.

In whatever degree the Boroughmongers diminish the interest of the Debt, they impoverish the hundreds of thousands of tradesmen and workmen in and near London. The very proposing of the diminution of the interest, in a way to make the measure likely to be carried, would plunge thousands upon thousands into ruin. The effect would be felt instantly through all that immense mass which forms the population of the metropolis and its environs. The subject would be discussed in every pot-house and in every workshop. The misery felt at the time would work along with the outcry of injustice. A flame would break out too strong to be smothered by the military; and the Boroughmongers would, at last, perish amidst the ruin created by themselves.

The likely result would be, that the Boroughmongers, and other plunderers, would be compelled to pay (as far as their means would go) the principal of the debt; and that the funding system would come, at once, to an end. It is quite clear, that the laws of the land have been all along violated; that the members of the parliament have usurped the people's rights; that Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the

Act of Settlement, the Act of Habeas Corpus; that all the constitutional laws of the country have been violated; that the people have been taxed not only without their own consent, but in their despite; that they have been forced, at the point of the bayonet, to submit to this tyrannical government. All this is notorious. And, is it to be supposed, then, that the people, if they regain their rights, and put an end to this tyranny, will consent to pay a debt which the tyrants have contracted, and the amount of which they have pocketed, or, at least, expended upon mercenaries for the purpose of upholding their usurped power? No: this is not to be supposed. It never can happen, that any people would be so unjust and so foolish. Nor is it to be supposed, that the many thousands of innocent persons, who have lent their money to those Boroughmongers, will be suffered to perish for want. This would be to favour and protect the robbers of the public at the expense of innocence and helplessness. No: it will be an easy matter to ascertain who it is that has *borrowed* the money. The lists of the Boroughs and of the owners of them, and of the tools put into the seats; the list of seat-renters; the list of sinecure-placemen, pensioners without service, of grantees, &c. will easily be ascertained, and, most assuredly, to them the nation would go for the means of paying the fundholders. Lord Darlington, for instance, who has had, of his *own*, *seven seats*, has been one of the *borrowers* of the money; and, I have no doubt, that his estate would bring *two millions of money*. Let me ask any honest man; no; let me ask even any *Cossack Priest*, whether this Boroughmonger's estate ought not to go to satisfy the just demands of the innocent persons, of whom he and his seven Members have been borrowing the sums which are impudently called the *public debt*.

But, besides the Boroughmongers, is it to be supposed, that a freely chosen Parliament; is it to be supposed, that *real representatives* of the people would leave in the hands of notorious public robbers the sum which they possess? Mr. Henry Hunt lately read a list of twenty of these who were in the receipt of *two hundred thousand pounds a year* in sinecures, manifestly given in exchange for votes, or for infamous services. Many of them had been possessed for 40 years, and hardly any one under

twenty years. Here, with compound interest, is a robbery, during the last 30 years (as an average) of 12,000,000 of pounds by only twenty families. Is it to be supposed, that a Parliament freely chosen would leave that pink of corruption, George Rose, in the possession of an estate with 200,000*l.* when it is notorious, that he was a purser of a ship during the first American war, and that he was a mere messenger at the offices in 1783? He has *extorted* this estate from Pitt and his successors, of whose base bribes he has been a principal agent, and of whose *secrets* he is one of the principal keepers. Were he a man of great talent, it would be another thing; but, being nothing but a jog-trot fellow; a mere *clerk* in manners as well as in mind, and having nought but impudence and profligacy to recommend him, the robbery which he has committed upon us becomes the more galling. His son George, who was the dirty tool of Canning in doing so much mischief with regard to America, and who is now *Envoy at Berlin!* this man is little better than a fool. A stupid creature, whom no merchant would trust with the management of any piece of business of importance. He did not stay long enough in America to secure his two thousand pounds a year for life on that account; so that the trip to Berlin was necessary, besides the large sum which this gives him in the shape of *plate*. This is to be the *heir* of his father, too, in a sinecure place of more than 3,000 pounds a year. Can a Cossack justify this scandalous waste of the earnings of the people? What must that man be made of, who will attempt to justify such oppression and insult.

The Attorney General, with ruin and death in his hands, prevents us from stating our case openly; but, it is well enough understood to produce a speedy shipping of these audacious robbers, if the power once returned, by no matter what means, into the hands of the right owners. The Boroughmongers and other plunderers would fain now leave the fundholders to perish; but, they want the *courage*; that is to say, not to commit such an atrocious act of injustice; but, to face *the people*, whom that act would necessarily bring to the doors of their House in spite of all the soldiers they could muster. It is notorious, that *Sir William Scott* has amassed a fortune of 700,000 pounds, in his few years of office as Judge of the Admi-

ralty. To be sure, the plunder has here come, in the first instance, from *neutral traders*, the rifling of whom this Midas shared with the bullies on the sea. But, at last, it has been the people of this country who have paid; for they had to pay for the *war*, which grew out of this plundering. The nation has to pay the interest of the Debt, which was contracted in making war on you; but, Scott has pocketed his 700,000 pounds, though the war failed of success. His brother, the Lord Chancellor, has, in *fees on Bankruptcies*, pocketed, for years past, more than *forty thousand pounds a year*, besides his other pay and perquisites. These two smooth, cool, cunning sons of a Durham coal-merchant have almost literally fattened upon the disgraces and miseries of the country. *Useful tools!* Exceedingly cunning and very able men. Surprising political hypocrites, and wonderful favourites of the king. The Lord Chancellor, at a dinner which is annually given in honour of the memory of Pitt by some of the choice friends of the System, has annually cried and blubbered, ever since the death of that eloquent patron of corruption, whom, in the speech he makes upon the occasion, the Chancellor always calls "his *dear* departed friend." It is well known to all who were acquainted with the events of 1801 and 1803 and 4, that he was incessantly at work to circumvent Pitt; that he represented Pitt as an enemy to the Church, and as a man of no religion; and, it is equally well known, that Pitt hated him like poison, and called him the *Tartuffe*.* The Scotts are, perhaps, the two

* This is not the only instance, in which a man of greater talents than another has had the resolution, for his own ambitious purposes, to make a sacrifice of his own consciousness of superiority to that other, and even to pretend the greatest affection for, and almost adoration of, that other, when he knew, too, that that other hated or despised him. SHERIDAN was to Mr. Fox what the Lord Chancellor is and has been to Pitt. Sheridan was always, while Fox was alive, not only professing an everlasting affection for him; but affecting to regard him as an oracle of wisdom and as a paragon of political purity; and, after Fox's death, I saw him at a meeting in Westminster, held to propose a successor to Fox, shed tears in floods at the thought, as he said, that he should live to see the day when a person so unworthy as himself should be proposed to sit in that seat, which had so long been filled by his beloved friend, whose parting breath he had received, and whose friendship had been

men who have managed their matters the best of any two in the kingdom. They have amassed more than half a million each, and have preserved fair characters all the while. Wrapped up in their

worth more than all the other enjoyments of his life. I knew while I was listening to him, that Fox had not only disliked him for many years, but that he even suspected him of treachery; and we all knew, that Fox, when he went into office, took special care to *shut him out of the cabinet*. But, until some time after, I did not know, that, when Fox was on his death-bed, and Sheridan's name was announced to him, Lord Grey being present, and preparing to go away, Fox caught him by the hand, and *bade him by no means to leave him alone with Sheridan*. Sheridan must have known of this dislike and suspicion. How, then, must we lament, that a man of such transcendent talents, talents far superior to those of Fox, should have stooped to act so mean a part! How I came to know the fact relative to the death-bed visit I cannot state publicly. I do know it, and if Lord Grey be asked, he will not deny that it is true. Ambition is very despicable when it thus swallows up sincerity. The Lord Chancellor knows that the name of Pitt does much with many powerful people, and, therefore, though he laughs within himself at the folly, he profits from it. So it was with Sheridan as to the name of Fox. However, Sheridan, with all his faults, has not been a plunderer to any extent, and, perhaps, has not very often been actuated by motives deliberately corrupt. He is not now in parliament, and I scarcely ever hear his name mentioned! They told a story of him, in London, about eighteen months ago, which made every body laugh. He had been out dining, had got completely drunk, and was lying by the side of a door in the street. The watchman, in rousing him up, asked him who he was, to which he replied that his name was *William Wilberforce*, Member of Parliament. Upon hearing this sanctified name, the watchman lifted up his eyes and exclaimed, *poor gentleman! he is sadly overtaken!* Having asked whither they should take him, he told the street and number of his house, and thus got safely carried home. Whether this story was true or not, it appears, that he is sunk into a mere sot. What an end for the most brilliant mind that has existed in England for an age! He was distinguished so much for his wit, that his solidity, his depth, the extent of his knowledge, were overlooked. The nation seemed to imagine that the brightest wit of the age could not also be the profoundest politician. But, in my opinion, he was; and whoever reads his speeches with attention, will, I think, find him by far the greatest man of his day. God forbid that I should not wish to see a son that I loved resemble Sheridan rather than those tame, cool, crafty,

gowns and wigs, they laugh at what is going on. In their private circles, though mean in their style of living, they are most pleasant and hearty men. The following anecdote, which I had from a Member of Parliament in 1811, will show you at once what sort of a man the Lord Chancellor is. At the first meeting of Parliament, in 1811, under the Regency, which took place in consequence of the madness of the king in the fall of the year 1810, the session was opened by Commissioners, of which, of course, the Lord Chancellor was one. There is a place in the House of Lords, which is called the *back of the throne*, through which the Lords pass to enter the House, and in which any Members of the House of Commons, who choose to be mere spectators, go and place themselves. As the Lord Chancellor was going through this part of the House to go to his seat, he leaned his head on one side, and said, in a whisper, to the gentleman of whom I am speaking: "What! are you come to hear our *damned nonsense*?" The gentleman, whom I will not name, gave me the anecdote as a proof of the contempt with which the greatest of the actors in the farce looked upon the farce itself. The hypocrisy of the Scotts is very different from that of Wilberforce. The latter is a man of cant, who carries hypocrisy into all the circumstances of life; a poor, mean deceiver, who is obliged to resort to the lowest of devices. The hypocrisy of the Scotts is of a grander sort, and never played off except for public purposes. Their hypocrisy is *official*; that of Wilberforce is *personal*. Theirs is assumed for the carrying of great ends; his is almost natural, and is used in all sorts of dirty work. They, the one Lord Chancellor, and the other Chief Judge of the Admiralty and Ecclesiastical Courts, are men of immense power; he is a dealer in small wares, for which he is eternally on the watch.

But, farce as this system may be to the Scotts, it is a *tragedy* to the people; and, certainly, justice will not be done,

unfeeling, and talentless creatures, Liverpool and Castlereagh; but God forbid, also, that I should not wish to see that son resemble Sir Francis Burdett rather than Sheridan. A man may be witty, eloquent, and burning with zeal, and may yet be a pattern of sobriety and all the private virtues.

unless these cormorants are made to *disgorge*. They know all this as well as I do. All the tribe of *Perceval* are crammed with public money. *Gibbs* is another cormorant of the first rank. The relations of *Castlereagh* have not received, within the last twenty years, less than *a million and a half of pounds*, besides the bribes which they have pocketed for the obtaining of places and titles. The *Addingtons* have pocketed half a million at least. The *Laws* and the *Kenyons* enormous sums. The *Scotch Lords*, amongst them, twenty or thirty millions, perhaps, of which the *Dundases* and the *Hopes* have swallowed a third part. The *Wellesleys*, exclusive of the "great Lord," have pocketed half a million, besides their enormous plunder in India. Nor am I for letting slip the *plunderers at sea*; for, though neutral traders were the parties plundered, this nation has, in the end, had to pay the penalty of the offence. Indeed, the nation was taxed, and money was borrowed in its name, for the purpose of building and fitting out ships, employed, in many cases, for the express purpose, and for no other purpose, than that of putting it in the power of commanders to *make their fortunes*. Nay, this has, in some cases, been, in part at least, the real cause of our late wars. A war with Spain might have taken place in 1805; but, to a certainty, it was hastened, and, perhaps, the balance was turned in favour of war, by the scheme of making the fortune of *Sir John Orde*, the brother of *Lord Bolton*, who had long been a most efficient cat's paw of Pitt, and, who, having, for the mere sake of money, married a bastard daughter of the Duke of Bolton, would never have been ennobled in any but this corrupt and degenerate reign.

To return to the sea plunderers; let me ask any one, whether it be just, that the people of England and Ireland should pay Debts, contracted for the purpose of making the fortunes of these plunderers? No: let the proceeds of the plunder be given up. There can exist no just government that will not insist upon such surrender. It is as just to make such men disgorge, as it is to empty the pockets of a thief; and, though these Blue and Buff gentry carry their heads so high; though they talk of their *honour*; though they strut and swagger about as if they were the lords of the creation; though their songs describe them as the most simple, and

kind-hearted, and *foolishly generous* of men; they have been neither more nor less than a horde of *pirates*; a greedy, grasping, remorseless, insolent set of men. And so far from simplicity and generosity making part of their character, they are amongst the most crafty and most selfish of mankind. A huckstering, jew-like crew, who never talk to you about any thing but *prize-money*; who have no sentiment as to the *cause* in which they are serving, any more than have the guns on board their ships. In fact, of late years, parents have sent their sons into the Navy, not for the sake of *fame*, but of *gain*; and to this principle these plunderers seem to have most steadily adhered. In many instances, it has been their practice to *ransom vessels* for sums of money; vessels which their own orders authorized them to make prize of, or to detain, and to send in for trial; and, in many cases, vessels of friendly powers, which their orders did *not* authorize them to molest. Vessels of both descriptions they have ransomed: the former to the injury of their own country, and the latter to the injury of its friends; but which friendly vessels found it less expensive to stop the jaws of these Cerberuses than to suffer detention and to wait the issue of a sham trial. Hundreds and hundreds of vessels were thus ransomed in the Mediterranean. In one particular case, a quarrel took place between a Captain *Campbell* and a Surgeon of the name of *Mant*, about the division of the spoil. *Mant* was sent on shore to receive the ransoms, at Trieste. When *Campbell* stopped a vessel, he made an agreement for the ransom. A boat was then sent in to *Mant* with an amount of the bargain, and a letter was sent, at the same time, by the master of the detained ship, to his owners or correspondents, informing them of the account of the ransom which they had to pay. When the ransom was paid to *Mant*, he gave a *passport for the vessel*. This was done to an enormous extent towards both friends and foes; towards Jews, Turks, and Christians. These people seem to have spared no religion, nation, or tongue.

I am not speaking here at guess. I have all the documents and proofs in my hands. I have heard all that both parties had to say. They quarrelled. *Mant* was reported to Lord Collingwood, who commanded in the Mediterranean at the time. *Mant* came home, and complained

to the Admiralty. No notice was ever taken of the matter. Indeed, the practice was notorious, and the Admiral was the greatest plunderer, or else Campbell never would have complained *to him* of Mant's having kept more than his *share* of plunder.

But, it is notorious, that this has been the practice in every sea; and, is it just, that the innocent and harmless people who have property in the funds should lose it, while these Pirates keep the money which they have stolen by making use of the ships and seamen paid for by the public? It is not just, and they will not, I trust, be permitted to keep it. Many of these pirates have thus amassed very large sums of money, and are actually the possessors of estates, which honest men, ruined by the taxes, have been compelled to sell. Many and many a family, whose ancestors have, for ages, lived upon the same estates, have now the mortification to see those estates in the hands of these piratical upstarts. And, shall this *remain* so? Certainly not, if a just government be ever established. Many of the fundholders are the remains of families of respectability in their several counties. Pressed by the taxgatherer, the owner of an estate, unable to live in his usual style upon his rents, has first mortgaged, and then sold, his estate, placing the money, remaining to him, in the funds; and thus exchanging the character of the country gentleman (once so honoured in England) for that of a mere state annuitant. The purchaser of the estate, nine times out of ten, has been a pirate or a plunderer, who has become rich from the same cause that the seller has become poor. And thus has taken place a revolution as complete as any community ever underwent.

Those two famous plunderers, *Sir John Jarvis* and *Sir Charles Grey*, are an instance of what this plundering system has effected. In 1793 they began their career by unlawfully seizing on a great number of American vessels in the French West-Indies. They sold these vessels; they pocketed the money; they came home with the money; the injustice of the seizure and sale was acknowledged by our government; the amount of the vessels and their cargoes was paid back to the owners of the vessels. But, *by whom*? Why, by the oppressed and insulted *people of England*; and not by the plunderers themselves, who sacked more

than a hundred thousand pounds upon this occasion, and who, by the means of this and other masses of pillage, started, from a very low origin, and from almost poverty, into a couple of *Earls* with large estates in land. It was curious to see the son of *Sir Charles Grey* at the head of an opposition to the war, while the father was raking together a fortune by serving in that war. *Jarvis*, too, was an opposition man; but, he was by no means opposed to taking plunder. These two men were called, after their West-India Expedition, "*Robbery and Murder.*" That they were guilty of both is certain, in the case of the Americans and their vessels, and *Grey* had been long famous for a very bloody act during the American revolutionary war.

The great *estates* possessed by *Earl St. Vincent* and *Earl Grey*, (late *Mr. Grey*, his father being dead,) what are they but lands which did belong to persons who have, at different times, been compelled to sell their estates, as above mentioned, and to become state annuitants? These two men are, in fact, possessors of estates, which they have plundered from the people of England. They rob the Americans of a hundred thousand pounds, for instance; the Americans make the people of England pay the money back; the people cannot do it without selling their estates; they sell them to "*Robbery and Murder,*" in order to raise the hundred thousand pounds; and thus these two Noble Peers became the lords of many Manors, and have whole troops of tenants, instead of being very obscure persons, as their fathers were. And, is it to be supposed, that they will be allowed to keep this plunder, while the fundholder, the innocent fundholder, who, in many cases, has become such by compulsion, is left to perish with hunger? But, it is not only the *direct plunder* of men of this description, that is to be taken into view. We must reckon the expense, which they have put us to in order to obtain the means of plundering. The fitting out, the provisioning, the paying of the ships; and, then, the *impressing* of the men, to serve on these piratical expeditions. How many families have been plunged into misery for the sake of gratifying these men's thirst for plunder! And, shall they be suffered to *keep* this plunder, while the fundholder is turned off to starve?

The immense sums that have been re-

ceived in what are called *Droits of Admiralty*, are so much plunder. They amount to more than *ten millions sterling*; and, in order to obtain possession of these *Droits*, what infamous acts, Good God! have been committed! Not only against foreign nations, not only against every thing appertaining to public law, but against the common feelings of compassion towards the people of England themselves. The *prizes* made from an enemy, *previous to a declaration of war*, are not held to belong to the captors, but to the *Admiralty*; that is to say, to the *Crown*, that is to say, to the *Ministers*, that is to say, to the *Boroughmongers*; and the immense sums thus acquired have been distributed according to the will of those who have had the most of what is called *parliamentary interest*, that is to say, who could command the greatest number of *votes*.

Thus, the *cream* of the plunder of every war has been wiped off *directly* by the *Boroughmongers*. Only think of the infamy of a practice like that of *beginning war before declaring it*! But, the practice itself, hateful as it is, is nothing, compared with the *motive*, which is neither more nor less than that of the vilest banditti. And, shall the *Boroughmongers* and their underlings be suffered to keep this plunder? It is impossible adequately to describe the miseries, the great mass of human miseries, which have flowed *directly* from this one source. It is well known, that, for many years, there were a great number of English families, and of other persons without their families, *detained* in France, as prisoners of war, at the rupture of the peace of Amiens. The English government, by the means of its corrupt and enslaved press, made the people here believe, that this was a pure act of tyranny on the part of Napoleon, and that there was not the least *reason* for it; "for," said the vile hypocrite, "*We have detained no Frenchmen in England. We have suffered them all to go away, like fair-dealing, civilized, and humane people, as we are.*" But, they took special good care not to tell the people, that, if they had detained nobody that was on *land*, they had, *before they had declared war*, swept the whole sea. Atlantic, Baltic, Mediterranean, and India seas, East and West, while all the unfortunate people, whom they thus robbed of their liberty as well as their property, were surprised to find that there was an *enemy* in any

part of the world! This fact the hypocrites took care not to blazon abroad; and, therefore, the people are, in some measure, to be excused for looking upon Napoleon as a sort of barbarian. He was always ready to give up the *detained English*, if we would give up the French persons and plunder, seized on before the declaration of war. It has since been clearly proved, that our government sent out orders to capture French ships and islands, in distant seas, *six weeks* before any declaration of war was *talked of*. These orders were sent out six weeks before Lord Whitworth left Paris. Was there ever foul play to surpass this? And how was Napoleon to obtain a chance of justice to the pillaged French, except by the means of retaliation? Alas! he had no chance at all; for, to have done the plundered French justice, the *Droits of Admiralty* must have been *surrendered*; the plunder must have been given up. Thus were hundreds and thousands of persons kept in prison many years. Great numbers died at a distance from their homes and friends, while our filthy prisons were filled with half-naked and half-starving Frenchmen. And all this to gratify the greediness of the *Boroughmongers*, their relations, and dependants.

In the carrying on of wars for this plundering purpose, as well as for other vile purposes, the National Debt has been contracted. And, is it just, that those who have innocently lent their money, should now lose it, while those who have divided the *Droits* amongst them retain that infamous plunder? The plunder from *your countrymen*, first and last, has not fallen short of fifty millions of pounds in amount. This sum has been divided amongst Doctors, Proctors, Judges, Agents, Officers, Crews, (whose shares have been very small,) and amongst the Royal family and other persons selected by the Ministry. But, while your countrymen have *lost* this immense sum, we, the people of England, have *not gained* it. On the contrary, we have paid for the ships to enable the plunderers to plunder; and, what is still worse, we have paid for, and have yet to pay for, *the war*, which this plundering finally produced.

Odious as is the light in which this government is thus placed, can any one deny that it is the *true light*? And, ought the people, or the innocent fundholders, to be the sufferers? The *Clergy*, too,

ought to come in for their share of the Debt; for, though they have not actually been engaged directly in the plunder of the war; though they have been neither pirates, marauders, or contractors; though they have not, like the Cochranes, Rosses, and Cockburns, and Wellesleys, been directly engaged in the plundering of ships and of houses; yet, they have, indirectly, done their part. They have uniformly, from first to last, urged on the war; they were always at the head of all the clamourers for the war, and, upon one occasion, they came forward *alone* to urge the government to continue the war, "in spite," as they said, "of the *clamours of the factious against it*." In short, they have been one of the bodies who have most efficiently laboured in the producing of the present state of things, to say nothing about the large share of the plunder which they have received in pensions for themselves, and wives, and daughters, commissions and offices for their sons and relations, and not to mention that some of the most corrupt of the Borough-agents are Clergymen of the Church. The Parson of this very Parish, for instance, received his living as a reward to his father, the Rev. Dr. Baker, for his *election interest*, in the Borough of Great Yarmouth, which was given up to the use of the *Earl of Bristol*! This is by no means a rare instance. Thus do bribery and perjury, in numerous instances, supply our pulpits!

Seeing, therefore, that the Church has had so much to do in *contracting the Debt*, the Church ought to pay its share of the liquidation money. The tithes and other Church property cannot amount to less, at this time, than about *eight millions a year*.

This, applied to the payment of the Debt, would do a *great deal*; for, as to the Clergy, they ought to be left to be maintained by voluntary contribution, unless the Debt can be otherwise paid. No man can say, that innocent fundholders ought to perish with hunger, while a shilling's worth of what is called Church property remains unapplied to their use.

The great resource, however, is in the estates of the Boroughmongers themselves; for, it is to them that the *piracies* and

all are owing. Their relations, bastards, and dependants, including the perjured wretches who carry on their sham elections, have been the pirates and plunderers, the contractors and jobbers of all sorts; and, therefore, to their estates we ought first to look; though, for my part, I never would stop, 'til there was not left a single innocent fundholder unpaid, if there were a single pound sterling left in the hands of any Boroughmonger, or pirate, or plunderer of any description.

Now, as I am persuaded, that, if the interest of the Debt should not continue to be paid, a system of *refunding* would very soon be adopted, I perfectly agree with the above writer, that "the friends of the present system would *disappear*." And, yet, to this it must come. This *must* be the end of the miseries under which the nation is now writhing. The fault will be that of the Boroughmongers themselves. They will have nobody but themselves to blame. They have been often warned of the final issue of their proceedings. They are now cruelly galled by language like that of the Courier. They do not like to hear their estates put upon a level with funded property. Yet, when they reflect on the probable consequences of a refusal to pay the interest of the Debt, they find themselves puzzled; they find, to their surprise, that the extinguishing of the spirit of freedom, is, in fact, *not yet completed*.

The blowing up of this funding system would be felt throughout the whole world. It is the grand rivet, by which mankind are held in slavery. The French nation would soon rush forth again; and, after the recent experience which the nations of Europe have had of the perfidy of Crowned Heads, those heads would not long be worn aloft over crouching people, were it not for the power of this *government*, which power depends *wholly* on the duration of the *funding system*. The *people* of England are quite prepared for breaking in sunder their own base bonds and the bonds of the rest of Europe. There only wants the blowing up of this corruption and tyranny to give the world a fair prospect of permanent freedom.

WM. COBBETT.

COPY RIGHT SECURED ACCORDING TO LAW

Published by H. Cobbett and G. S. Oldfield, at No. 19 Wall-Street, New-York.